



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/735,405

12/12/2003

Jane Smith Parker

190250-1690

2122

38823

7590

01/25/2008

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP/

AT&T Delaware Intellectual Property, Inc.

600 GALLERIA PARKWAY, S.E.

SUITE 1500

ATLANTA, GA 30339-5994

EXAMINER

DANNEMAN, PAUL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3627

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/735,405	Applicant(s) PARKER, JANE SMITH	
	Examiner PAUL DANNEMAN	Art Unit 3627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3 December 2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Application

1. This action is in reply to Applicant's response to the first office action, filed on 18 December 2007.
2. Claims 1-22 are pending.
3. Applicant did not amend any of the claims.
4. Applicant has responded to the non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of Claims 1-22. Applicant will submit a terminal disclaimer upon indication of otherwise allowable subject matter, if such is still needed at that point.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant argues with regard to Claim 1 and its dependent claims that McDuff does not teach, or suggest ***"logic configured to determine an operator efficiency parameter by integrating the set of switching statistics with the set of work statistics;"***. Examiner has closely reviewed Applicant's argument and while not directly disclosing the limitation, McDuff et al. in at least Column 3, lines 5-8 discloses gathering statistics regarding agent calling activity and in lines 18-26 further discloses that some of the agent calling activity gathered is agent's average handling time, average work time, average talk time, etc. and in lines 27-33 still further discloses that the statistical data is used to generate reports useful to a supervisor or other manager. It is therefore obvious, at the time of the invention, to a person of ordinary skill in the art to conclude that McDuff et al. collects and manipulates the call center agent work related statistics as a means of determining an agent's productivity and the effectiveness of the call center and its policies and is identical in function to applicant's use of switching and work statistics to determine an operator efficiency parameter. Therefore, Examiner maintains that **Claims 1 and 3-7 were properly rejected and remain rejected.**
6. Applicant argues with regard to Claim 2, ***"that Stuart does not make up for any deficiencies of McDuff as noted above."*** Examiner notes in response to the argument above that McDuff does

not have any deficiencies related to determining an operator efficiency parameter; therefore Stuart is only used to address the limitation not clearly disclosed in McDuff in relation to **“a bonus payment calculation to the operator.”** Therefore, **Claim 2 was properly rejected and remains so.**

7. Applicant argues with regard to Claim 8 and its dependent claims, ***“determining an operator efficiency parameter by integrating the set of switching statistics with the set of work statistics;”***. Examiner has closely reviewed Applicant's argument and while not directly disclosing the limitation, McDuff et al. in at least Column 3, lines 5-8 discloses gathering statistics regarding agent calling activity and in lines 18-26 further discloses that some of the agent calling activity gathered is agent's average handling time, average work time, average talk time, etc. and in lines 27-33 still further discloses that the statistical data is used to generate reports useful to a supervisor or other manager. It is therefore obvious, at the time of the invention, to a person of ordinary skill in the art to conclude that McDuff et al. collects and manipulates the call center agent work related statistics as a means of determining an agent's productivity and the effectiveness of the call center and its policies and is identical in function to applicant's use of switching and work statistics to determine an operator efficiency parameter. Therefore, Examiner maintains that **Claims 8 and 9-16 were properly rejected and remain rejected.**
8. Applicant argues with regard to Claim 17 and its dependent claims that McDuff does not teach, or suggest ***“computer-readable code that configures the device to determine an operator efficiency parameter by integrating the set of switching statistics with the set of work statistics;”***. Examiner has closely reviewed Applicant's argument and while not directly disclosing the limitation, McDuff et al. in at least Column 1, lines 33-42, lines 60-67 and Column 2, lines 1-8 discloses a computerized monitoring system for monitoring telephony resources, gathering raw data from the switching mechanism in a call center. McDuff et al. in at least Column 3, lines 5-8 discloses gathering statistics regarding agent calling activity and in lines 18-26 further discloses that some of the agent calling activity gathered is agent's average handling time, average work time, average talk time, etc. and in lines 27-33 still further discloses that the

statistical data is used to generate reports useful to a supervisor or other manager. It is therefore obvious, at the time of the invention, to a person of ordinary skill in the art to conclude that McDuff et al. collects and manipulates the call center agent work related statistics as a means of determining an agent's productivity and the effectiveness of the call center and its policies and is identical in function to applicant's use of switching and work statistics to determine an operator efficiency parameter. Therefore, Examiner maintains that **Claims 17 and 19-22 were properly rejected and remain rejected.**

9. Applicant argues with regard to Claim 18, ***"that Stuart does not make up for any deficiencies of McDuff as noted above."*** Examiner notes in response to the argument above that McDuff does not have any deficiencies related to determining an operator efficiency parameter; therefore Stuart is only used to address the limitation not clearly disclosed in McDuff in relation to **"a bonus payment calculation to the operator."** Therefore, **Claim 18 was properly rejected and remains so.**

Double Patenting

10. **Claims 1-22** are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over **claims 7-8, 10, 12-16, 21-23, and 25-30 of copending Application No. 11/314,045**. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because **both applications are based on generating an efficiency report**. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious

Art Unit: 3627

at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. **Claims 1, 3-15, and 19-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDuff et al., US Patent 6,490,350 B2.

Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 14-15, 17, and 19:

With regard to the limitations:

- ***Obtaining and using a set of switching statistics from a communication switch database to determine the quantity related performance of an operator;***
- ***Obtain a set of work statistics to determine the quality related performance of an operator;***

McDuff et al. in at least Column 1, lines 33-42, lines 60-67 and Column 2, lines 1-8 discloses a computerized monitoring system for monitoring telephony resources, gathering raw data from the switching mechanism in a call center; with the ability to gather status information and statistics regarding the calling activity of agents within the call center. Therefore, it would be obvious, at the time of the invention, to a person of ordinary skill in the art to determine that McDuff et al. produces statistics equivalent to applicant's invention.

McDuff et al. does not specifically disclose the following limitations per se:

- ***Determine an operator efficiency parameter by integrating switching and work statistics;***
- ***Determine when operator efficiency parameter exceeds an expected efficiency parameter.***

However McDuff et al. in at least Column 3, lines 5-8 discloses gathering statistics regarding agent calling activity and in at least Column 3, lines 18-26 further discloses some of the information regarding an agent's average handling time, average work time, average talk time, etc. McDuff, et al. in at least Column 3, lines 27-33 still further discloses that the monitoring server provides an

automated way to gather useful statistics, classify the statistical data and generate reports useful for a supervisor or other manager. Therefore, it would be obvious, at the time of the invention, to a person of ordinary skill in the art to conclude that McDuff et al. collects and manipulates statistical call center agent work related information and produces reports useful to a supervisor and manager to manage the personnel related activities of a call center.

Claims 4-6, 10-13, and 20-22:

With regard to the limitations:

- Communication switch statistics are from a POTS;
- Operator quality parameters are for telephone calls from customers;
- Operators may be of any job grade level.

McDuff et al. in at least Fig. 1, Column 3, lines 35-65 discloses a portion of a telecommunications network of a call center connected to a public switched telephone network (PSTN) and in at least Column 4, lines 17-22 and Fig. 1 further discloses that the call/telephony integrated monitoring server is connected to an automated resource management system (ARMS). McDuff et al. in at least Column 3, lines 27-33 further discloses some of the operator quality and quantity parameters related to telephone calls from customers and for business clients that are collected. McDuff et al, in at least Column 5, lines 63-67 still further discloses that statistics may be for agents, supervisors, business clients, and call status encompassing the whole of the call center operation. Therefore, it would be obvious at the time of the invention, to a person of ordinary skill in the art to acknowledge that a PSTN is sometimes referred to as the Plain Old Telephone Service (POTS) and that the operator related statistics in a call center are relative operators regardless of their grade level and that McDuff et al. fully discloses all the limitations of the applicant's invention.

13. **Claims 2, 16 and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDuff et al. as applied to **claims 1, 3-17 and 19-22** above, and further in view of Stuart et al., US Publication 2001/0032120 A1.

Claims 2, 16 and 18:

McDuff et al. does not specifically disclose the following limitations:

- ***Bonus payment to an operator;***

However, Stuart et al. in at least Paragraph [0009] discloses a system for evaluating call agent efficiency and the agent cost data and determining a cost based performance indicator. Stuart et al. in at least Paragraph [0054] discloses that the evaluation of a call agent's efficiency could enable management to introduce a valid 'pay for performance' system. Therefore, it would be obvious, to a person of ordinary skill in the art to ascertain that a 'pay for performance' system encompasses a bonus payment and that a call center owner would be motivated to modify McDuff et al.'s monitoring statistics with Stuart et al.'s call agent productivity and reward system to minimize lost productivity (Stuart et al., Paragraph [0006]).

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAUL DANNEMAN whose telephone number is (571)270-1863. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. 6AM-5PM Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Florian Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Paul Danneman/

Examiner, Art Unit 3627

19 January 2008

/F. Ryan Zeender/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627